

**Comments on the proposed precedence of *Nahecaris* Jaekel, 1921 (Malacostraca, Phyllocarida, Archaeostraca) over *Dilophaspis* Traquair in Walther, 1903 (Case 3281; see BZN 60: 269–271)**

The following persons (1–6) have sent comments in support of the proposed precedence of *Nahecaris* Jaekel, 1921 over *Dilophaspis* Traquair in Walther, 1903. *Nahecaris* is based on one of the best known species of middle Palaeozoic crustaceans and it has been widely used since 1921. They all agree that the name is so well-known that confusion would ensue if the arguments of Hahn (1990) and Brauckmann et al. (2002) are followed. Briggs & Bartels provide a clear case for conservation of the name *Nahecaris*.

(1) Jan Bergström

*Swedish Museum of Natural History, SE-104 05 Stockholm, Sweden*

(2) David L. Bruton

*University of Oslo, Norway*

(3) Herbert Lutz

*Natural History Museum, Mainz / State Collection of Natural History of Rhineland-Palatinate, Germany*

(4) David J. Siveter

*Department of Geology, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH, U.K.*

(5) Derek J. Siveter

*Oxford University Museum of Natural History, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PW, U.K.*

(6) Jean Vannier

*UMR 5125 - PEPS, Université Claude Bernard LYON 1, 2 rue Raphaël Dubois, 69622 Villeurbanne Cedex, France*

(7) R.J. Aldridge

*Department of Geology, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH, U.K.*

Given that *Nahecaris* has been widely used since 1921, and that the nature of the original partial specimen of *Dilophaspis* as an arthropod, rather than a fish, was not

confirmed until 1990, I consider that there are strong reasons for retaining the well-known name *Nahecaris*.

(8) Bruce S. Lieberman

*Department of Geology, University of Kansas, 1475 Jayhawk Blvd.,  
120 Lindley Hall, Lawrence, KS 66045, U.S.A.*

I support Briggs & Bartels's application and their arguments and hope that the Commission will approve their proposals. In particular, I believe that the use of *Dilophaspis* over *Nahecaris* would cause considerable taxonomic confusion. *Nahecaris* is probably the best and most completely known fossil phyllocarid. I have worked with fossil phyllocarid crustaceans and in the course of this work I have dealt with the definition of the genus *Nahecaris* (Rode & Lieberman, 2002). Based on Briggs & Bartels's suggestions I think it would make perfect sense to give *Nahecaris* precedence over *Dilophaspis*. This would considerably aid and facilitate my taxonomic work with this group, and also likely that of my colleagues.

#### **Additional reference**

Rode, A. & Lieberman, B.S. 2002. Phylogenetic and biogeographic analysis of Devonian phyllocarid crustaceans. *Journal of Paleontology*, **76**: 271–286.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of usage of the specific names of *Libellula aenea* Linnaeus, 1758 (currently *Cordulia aenea*) and *L. flavomaculata* Vander Linden, 1825 (currently *Somatochlora flavomaculata*; Insecta, Odonata) by the replacement of the lectotype of *L. aenea* with a newly designated lectotype (Case 3253; see BZN **60**: 272–274)**

Klaas-Douwe B. Dijkstra

*Gortestraat 11, 2311 MS Leiden, The Netherlands*

I fully support the conservation of usage of the name *Cordulia aenea* (Linnaeus, 1758) which is crucial for me as editor of a forthcoming field guide to the Western Palaearctic dragonflies, illustrated by the well known natural history illustrator Richard Lewington. Such publications stimulate public interest and rely heavily on the stability of names.

**Comments on the proposed precedence of *Bolboceras* Kirby, 1819 (July) (Insecta, Coleoptera) over *Odonteus* Samouelle, 1819 (June)**

(Case 3097; see BZN **59**: 246–248, 280–281, **60**: 303–311, **61**: 43–45)

(1) Frank-Thorsten Krell

*Department of Entomology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road,  
London SW7 5BD, U.K.*